Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Division I
Section 7
Shelf
Number

THE

# Jewish Expositor,

AND

## FRIEND OF ISRAEL.

## *OCTOBER*, 1819.

### EXTRACTS FROM THREE LETTERS TO A FRIEND, ON UNITARIANISM.

#### LETTER II.

*December*, 1817.

"THE second particular of your complaint is the more serious one,—and I wish to meet it with all seriousness of mind, such, indeed, as a point of everlasting moment imperiously demands. The matter of your complaint is this,—that you are "brought to the same bar with Mahomet and Socinus," and you find in my letter "no support whatever" for so heavy a charge. Before I proceed to shew that you do verily occupy common ground with the characters already mentioned, suffer me to observe, that my aim is not so much to oppose you, my friend, in adopting what you think to be truth, or those with whom you have of late associated; do you, and let your friends, think for themselves, as I intend to do for my own self: but, occupied as I am daily, and have been for years past, in the pursuit of Bible truth, and in a humble but earnest endeavour to defend what appears to bear the royal image and superscription, —I dare not, and cannot be indifferent to the publication of sentiments so adverse to those which have been deduced by so many pious and learned men from a most laborious study of the scriptures, and to those also which have prevailed in all the acknowledged churches of Christ, at home and abroad, from the reformation to the present hour; so that we might adopt the apostolic expression, and say, "If any one seem to be contentious, we have no such doctrine, neither the churches of God." It might be said, not from the reformation only, but from the first ages; for even Dr. Priestley confesses, as every body must do, that the present currently received doctrine of a threefold distinction of person in the Oneness of the divine Essence, was established as scriptural by the council at Nice, in the year of our Lord

325: and it is easy to trace it, through the channel of the Greek and Latin fathers, whose invaluable treatises are still in existence, up to the apostolic age. And this has been often and ably done.

With this preamble, I come to the point. The ground occupied by all Unitarians of whatever species, whether Deistical, Jewish, Mahometan, Socinian, Arian, Sabellian, or Swedenborgian, is this, —That the Deity is a simple Unity, and such as by no means admits of any kind of plurality of personal distinctions; or in other words, God is one *in Person* as truly as he is one in Essence. Now if you voluntarily subscribe to this as an article of faith, rather, of reason and infidelity, since it forms the basis of the respective systems of those reasoning infidels, the disciples of Mahomet and Socinus,—why do you so dread the imputation? If you avow this as a fundamental tenet, why contemn those who have done so before you? Why draw back, horror-struck, from an association with those strenuous asserters of the Unitarian system, if, in so essential a point as the great Object of worship, and the grand universal Cause of all, you confessedly agree in opinion with them? These characters cannot be so far from truth as Trinitarians, if your opinion is the correct one; since it can never be so egregious an error to fall into a misapprehension respecting the person of Christ, as to entertain inconsistent ideas in reference to the nature of God. For if Trinitarians are wrong, their whole scheme of religion is a sad system of idolatry; whereas the persons before mentioned are correct in their notions of Deity, supposing Unitarianism to be true, and they err only in the comparatively minor point of the incarnation. Dr. Carpenter, the zealot of the day for the doctrine of Socinus, or, as he would express it, for that of Unitarianism, uses the precise language which you yourself adopt, namely, that the God and Father of Christ is alone the true God; and which, if spoken of the Godhead in contradistinction to the manhood, admits of a good sense,—it asserts the one God to be "the head of Christ;" but when it is employed in another sense, namely, to oppose the Divinity of the Son of God, and the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit, it is then misused,—it goes to set scripture at variance with itself, and even to represent the Father himself as uttering an untruth, when "unto *the Son*" he saith, "Thy throne, *O God!* is for ever and ever." In a letter which is still extant, the socinian party in these realms "return thanks to God, that he hath preserved the emperor of Morocco and his subjects in the excellent knowledge of one only sovereign God, who hath *no distinction or plurality of persons.*" They say, moreover, that "they with their pens defend the faith of one supreme God, and that God raised up Mahomet to do the same with the sword as a scourge on idolizing Christians." They celebrate the modern tribes of *arianizing* Christians (and this includes all those who adopt the Unitarian Hypothesis), as "asserters of the proper Unity of God."

Am I not then justified in classing you with Mahomet and Socinus? Do you not make common cause with them in opposing the idea of a Trinity of persons

in the Unity of the Godhead? Just as you, with your newly adopted Unitarian sentiments, are justified, according to your present views of the subject, in accounting *me* an idolizing Christian? No sort of benefit can accrue to you or me, from disguising the real state of the case; if we hope to reap advantage from discussion, we must resolve to use great plainness of speech. We must lay open the naked fact; and the naked fact is this,—that either you are right, and we are idolaters—or we are right, and you are now "without God in the world." For he that abideth in "the doctrine of Christ, he hath *both the Father* and *the Son* (και τον πατερα, και τον υιον)," but "whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ (according to this apostolical exposition of it,) *hath not God*." (2 John, 9.) The statement of the beloved apostle, in his first Epistle, is very striking: he does not tell us, that he who has the Father, has the Son, because *then*, as *now*, there were those who held for one person in God the Father, and denied the Son to be equally a person in the Deity; but he tells us, that "he that acknowledgeth *the Son*, hath the Father also." For those who hold for the Sonship have ever held for the Paternity likewise; but they that err in this prime article, are too often wrong throughout,—"whosoever denieth *the Son*, the same hath not the Father." You think you have the Father, although you deny the Son; but it cannot be. The Apostle is positive on the question, and in the nature of the thing it must be so. And indeed you yourself acknowledge that you are as destitute of the Father, *as a divine Person*, as you are of the Son; for you say that the paternal name is merely a title which relates to an "inferior nature, a relation as Father and Son with reference to the Godhead *and manhood*." If so, God is a Father in a higher sense, for he has *Sons* who, in nature or order of being, are represented as superior to the manhood of Christ. The *angels* are called the Sons of God, and not being allied to matter, but purely incorporeal spirits, they are not liable to death, nor indeed to any evil whatever save what is mental, but are immortal, and unincumbered with the frailties and infirmities of humanity;—"but we see *Jesus*, made a little (or, for a little time) *lower than the angels*," and this expressly "for the suffering of death." Here is the depth of his humiliation; he stooped down to the lowest in the scale of intellectual Beings,—"for verily, he took not on *the Angels*, but he took on *the seed of Abraham*,"—and this, "that he should taste death." Therefore it must be insisted upon, that the highest kind of paternity which may be predicated of the divine Being, according to your limited views of it, arises from the relation of God to the angels, they being declared to be *the Sons* of God of the highest order. It must also be insisted upon, that since Jesus was made lower than, that is, inferior to (ηλαττωμενον), the angels, he is necessarily, *as a Son*, inferior to those beings, supposing his Sonship to be, as you assert, "applicable to Christ exclusively in his *manhood*." These positions, upon your principles, are incontrovertible. And thus you reduce the *Son* of God, as a Son, to a level with the creatures, since of them all it may be said that they are "also his *offspring*." But in opposition to all this, the scrip-

ture sets the Son infinitely beyond all created beings, and makes *him*, "and the Father," to be, εν θεον, one Godhead. Hence it is "the Son," whom the Father hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds, who is the brightness of glory, and the express image of his substantial Divinity, and upholds all things by the word of his power. Being made (naturally) *so much better* (not lower) *than the angels*, as he hath *by inheritance* (deriving or inheriting it from the Father) obtained a *more excellent name* than they," that is, the name of *Son* by birth and not by creation. "*For*, unto which of the angels said he at any time, "Thou art my *Son?*" If we were to stop here, we might answer, that often, and in many places, both men and angels are so called. But if we proceed, we shall find that the peculiarity is made to center in his being a *begotten* Son, and so connatural, or of one and the same divine nature, with the Father; whence arises a *divine* Paternity, and a *divine* Filiation, both of which you confess yourself destitute of upon your hypothesis,—and therefore you lie exposed to that of the apostle, wherein he says of a certain one, that he "denieth *the Father and the Son.*" "For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art *my Son*, this day have *I begotten thee?*" Accordingly, "when he bringeth in the *First begotten* into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God *worship him.* And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, &c. but unto *the Son*,—Thy throne, *O God!* is for ever and ever."

You see then how great a difference obtains between us. *We* worship the Father, the Son incarnate, and the Holy Spirit, as distinct personal agents in Jehovah. *You* consider this to be idolatrous; you agree with Mr. ———, in conjunction with Priestley, Mahomet, and others, in condemning such devotion as being a worship of three Gods,—and what is that but idolatry.? But if we are right in adoring the Alehim in Jehovah, in the name of Father, Son, and Spirit,—then you, in rejecting the Alehim of the Hebrews, are guilty of rejecting the God of the Bible; and since there is no other God but he, according to that in the law of Moses, "Ye shall not go after *other Alehim*," but "ye shall diligently keep the commandments of Jehovah *your Alehim*" (Deut. vi. 14—17.),—since these Alehim of Israel (I say *these*, for in both places of the above passage the expressions *other* and *your* Alehim are in the plural number)—since these Alehim are *the only Jehovah*, do you not evidently relapse into a sort of Atheistical state? This despised doctrine of our day, stands in the forefront of the inspired oracles; for in the beginning "the Alehim created the heavens and the earth." These are they who said, "*We* will make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness." And that we might not imagine any other Makers or Creators than the self-existent Deity, it is added that "*Jehovah*, the Alehim, made the earth and the heavens," —and also that "Jehovah the Alehim formed man of the dust of the ground." And it is in accordance with this glorious constitution of the supreme Being that we read in Ecclesiastes of *Creators* in the plural; "Remember thy *Boraim*," says Solomon, that is, "thy Creators, in the days of thy youth." These *Bo-*

*raim* are called "the Alehim," throughout the chapter (Eccl. xii). For the same reason we are reminded of our *Makers* in the Psalms—"Sing to Jehovah a new song, his praise in the congregation of saints; let Israel rejoice in his *ashim*," that is, "his Makers," or them that made him. (cxlix. 1, 2.) And that I may not weary you with a multitude of instances, where a few may suffice, let the following from Isaiah (liv. 5.) conclude this paragraph. Literally translated, the verse would read thus,—"for thy Makers are thy husbands, Jehovah the Defenders is his name, even thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel, the Alehim of the whole earth shall he be called." *Jehovah* is never put in a state of regimen or government, and, therefore, *Sabaoth*, the Hosts or Defenders, must be considered as in apposition with it, in the same manner as the title Alehim always is, on which account we read it, Jehovah Alehim, the Lord God, and not Jehovah *of* Alehim. Here then, you have four plural titles of Deity within an exceeding small compass, and three in the singular number, "For thy *ashim* are thy *baalim*, Jehovah *Sabaoth* is his name, even thy Goel, the Kedosh of Israel, the *Alehim* of the whole earth shall he be called." You will observe, that the Unity is still preserved, notwithstanding that the pluripersonality is so strongly intimated. And some of the Unitarian order have been disposed to do us justice on this head,—"even Crellius," it is remarked, "who has been reckoned the most acute of the Socinians, is candid enough to acknowledge, that they who hold the Trinity, are not justly chargeable with believing more *Gods* than one, because of the strict Unity which they maintain to subsist in the divine *essence*."

After asserting that my former letter contained no support to my charge of your Unitarianism, (for it was in this particular, that I affirmed your coincidence with Mahomet, Socinus, and others) instead of examining the leading features of my letter, you say, "I will confine the few observations I shall make, to the single question, Whose *Son* is he?" This is rather limiting the ground, but as I intend, if God permit, to revert on a future occasion to the other topics, I shall follow your example, and confine my observations at present to your ideas of the Sonship of Christ.

You say, "I have no hesitation in asserting, that the terms, Son, Only-begotten, &c. are applicable to Christ exclusively in his manhood, and that Scripture does not warrant us to conclnde that they are descriptive titles of a person in the Godhead; they are relative ones, and apply to a superior and inferior nature—a relation as Father and Son, with reference to the Godhead and Manhood. The idea of Father and Son, in abstract Deity, leads me into an acknowledgment of inferiority on the part of the Son. Self-existence seems essential to the idea of God; but I necessarily lose this, when the relationship of Father and Son in the deity is maintained. It does not appear to me to be a mystery, but a contradiction. That a Son be-begotten of the Father, should be self-existent and eternal with that Father, is a proposition the mind does not seem capable of receiving." I have here given the substance of your opinion on the Sonship of Christ, with the

objections you have, to what is called the orthodox idea on the subject; and I am glad of an opportunity like the one now afforded me, of arriving at Mr. ——'s exact opinion through an authentic channel, since you add, "I have kept as closely as possible to Mr. ——'s statements, thinking them best adapted to my present purpose."

Your entire view of the subject appears to me too low and grovelling, as though you could entertain no higher apprehensions of this divine mystery, than such as are suggested to you from the circumstances of mere animal existences. Your conceptions arise evidently from carnal reasonings, rather than from a faithful reception of scriptural representations. You seem to insinuate as if the human mind could attain to no sublimer ideas of paternity and filiation, than what are to be deduced by analogy from those relations amongst men. Although the human mind itself should seem to be capable of proposing a satisfactory solution; since what are mind and thought, but as parent and offspring? And are they not *coeval*, and of one and the same nature, notwithstanding that they are thus related? For thought springs from mind, not mind from thought; and so essential is thought to mind, that its own existence is co-extensive with that of its parent. And these are distinguishable, but not to be divided; to divide is to destroy. Separate thought from mind, and it is mind no longer. So, "whosoever denieth *the Son*, the same hath not the *Father*." But paternity and filiation even amongst men might have sufficed, if rightly considered, to have corrected you in your inference. For a proper son, so far from being *inferior*, is necessarily of the precise identical nature of his father. In distinction of person they are *two*, but in identity of nature *one*. Hence, the whole human race is often included in a singular term.—Man; "I will destroy *Man* whom I have created." And Adam and Eve are called "The Man,"—"Behold, the Man is become as one of us;" and so he "drove out the Man, &c." because, although they had a distinct subsistence as persons, yet they were not different beings in point of nature; and, therefore, it is recorded, that God called "*their* name, *Adam*," just as we call Father and Son and Spirit, *their* name *God*. So that upon revolving your position, of an inferiority of nature on the part of the Son, you will perceive it to involve an absurdity. For, in his divine person, Christ is called the Son of the Father, his own proper and peculiar Son, even his sole-begotten; and as such, he is represented as being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his substantial divinity. Thus Adam begat "in his own likeness;" his son, like himself, was in every respect a proper man, possessing all those faculties and powers, both mental and corporeal, which are as it were, the natural attributes of humanity, so as, that the begotten was in no sense *inferior* to the begetter. Now apply this to the point in debate, only in a way consistent with a spiritual and an *eternal* Being. The Son was always in "the bosom of the Father," as, to compare great things with small, thought is always imbosomed in mind. There never was a vacuum there; the paternal glory was never without

its brightness; nor was God the Father ever without the express image of his own substantial divinity in the person of that *Son* whom he himself calls *God*, and commands to be honoured and worshipped even as himself. Self-existence is not at all endangered here, as you apprehend. Self-existence is no more applicable to the Father, *as a Father*, than to the Son as a Son, but it applies to them rather as God; it applies to the Godhead as Jehovah, and not so immediately to the persons as the Alehim or distinct subsistences in it. You, yourself, define Father to be a relative term; you will, therefore, be prepared to acknowledge, that Father is as dependent on Son, as the idea of a Son is dependent upon that of a Father. They are *correlates*, and can only exist as such, together. So that the divine Three are socially existent as persons, and self-existent as God. Consequently, your language, borrowed from Mr. ——, is totally incongruous, when you talk of a "begotten God," and of a "Son" being "self-existent with the Father." Expressions so unsuitable to the subject, argue an extreme unacquaintedness with it. Neither can *God* be *begotten* in any proper sense, nor can a *Son* (or even a Father), be as such, self-existent. This you affirm yourself, when you declare them both to be *relative* terms. God is absolutely unoriginated, as Jah or Jehovah the sole eternal; having neither cause nor commencement of being, but in and from his own nature; and the persons of Father and Son, and that of the Spirit also, are co-essential, and therefore co-eternal as the socially-subsisting Alehim, who are called in Hebrew *hayim*, that is to say, *the living ones*. Hence, the Spirit is said to be eternal, and is described as the Spirit of life, or the life-creating Spirit; which two ideas of eternity and a causing to be to other existences, are peculiar to Deity. And the Son is "the life" emphatically, having life in himself as the Father has, and possessing the power of communicating life to other Beings (John v. 21—26. i. 4. and 1 John i. 3. 5, 20). In a word, the terms, Father, Son, and Spirit, relate to the personal distinctions of the Alehim, and not to the essence of Jehovah. Yet, Jehovah is immutable in himself, and, therefore, he ever was, what he now is. If then he is revealed to us under a triune name in the New Testament, and is declared to be "three" in person, and that "these three are one" in nature and essence, he never was other than the same triune Being; and hence, the reason of that august title in the Old Testament, which so strongly expresses a pluri-personality in the effable Godhead, "the Alehim of eternity, Jehovah the Creator." (Isa. xl. 28.) I am aware of the attempt of some, to restrict the meaning of Alehim to Jehovah and the Man Christ, as if it intended *two* persons, not *three*. Mr. ——, in his sermon on the Holy Spirit, refers us to Genesis ii. 7. to prove, that *Jehovah and his Son Jesus* formed the body of Adam. But Moses there informs us, that "Jehovah, the Alehim, formed man;" in agreement with his previous account of the transaction in Gen. i. 26, "and the Alehim said, *We* will make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness." Now, in Hebrew, according to the points, Alehim is not of the *dual* number, as if

it was intended to convey the idea of a duality of persons only, but it is *plural*, and is, therefore, very strikingly coincident with the *trinal* name of the Deity which obtains in the New Testament. If we found no other terms than those of God and Christ, in the Gospel, this hypothesis might seem to have some foundation; but since this is not the case, but, in addition to such expressions as convey the idea of the one Godhead in Christ Jesus, we meet with three personal titles, the Father, Son, or Word, and the Holy Spirit the Comforter, which intimate the co-existence of a *triad* of persons, and not a *duality* in the Godhead itself, this supposition of Mr. ———, and others, appears manifestly to have no sort of foundation in truth, but is, as it were, "the baseless fabric of a vision." And to corroborate the opinion of a Trinity, in opposition to that of a duality, let it be observed in addition, that as, in the Old Testament, we have several examples of the plural epithet *Kedoshim*, the holy ones, or the Holies, adopted in reference to the *Alehim*,—so, to fix the exact number of these holies, and to place a point so momentous beyond the possibility of all reasonable doubt, we are happily supplied with an instance like the following, where the singular *Kedosh* is *thrice* repeated,—*Holy, holy, holy*, Jehovah Sabaoth." And you will be naturally led yourself to associate with this, from the Hebrew scriptures, that equally decisive instance which proposes itself to us from the Greek; I mean the coincidence between the *trinal* name of Father, Son, and Spirit, in which the first disciples were commissioned both to teach and to baptize; and that form of adoration which obtains amongst the unerring celestials in the world of perfected spirits, — "*Holy, holy, holy*, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." (Isa. vi. Rev. iv.)

Admitting what has been advanced to be bottomed upon solid proof, you will allow that the language of John is admirably adapted to express the personal distinctions in God, without an infringement of the Unity of the divine nature; for in saying there are *three* witnesses in heaven, he employs the masculine gender denoting the persons; whereas in asserting that these three *are one*, he employs the neuter, implying their common divinity. Indeed, the apostle directly declares, that the testimony of these three, is "the witness *of God*." And, perhaps, you may not esteem it irrelative to the subject, if a passage is adduced from the Hebrew Scriptures not altogether dissimilar from this of St. John; for inasmuch as the apostle describes the Father, Son, and Spirit, under the character of witnesses; the prophet Daniel introduces them as *Watchers*, in allusion to their unremitting care, and ever wakeful vigilance, in their superintendance of the complicated affairs of the universe—"This matter is by the decree of *the Watchers*, and the demand by the fiat of *the Holy Ones*." Nor are we left to our own surmises, as to who these *airin kedishin*, these Holies the Watchers, are; for that they are one *supreme* is declared in the context—"This is the decree of *Elia*," that is, "of the Most High, *who ruleth* in the kingdom of men." And yet again, lest you should hence imagine Elia

the most High to be God, and the Watchers, the Holy Ones, to be some inferior beings, the prophet instantly reverts to the plural style, and says, "And whereas *they* commanded to leave the stump of the tree-roots, thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee, after that thou shalt have known that the *shemim*," that is, "the heavenlies, *do rule*." (Dan. iv.)

The beloved apostle preserves the same idiom, when he introduces the *Son* asserting himself, and the *Father*, to be one. And certainly, if we credit the declaration, that these *two* are, as Father and Son, *one*, it must be acknowledged to be in the sense of an identity of *nature*. Upon this plain statement you fall a reasoning, and reason yourself, as your first parents did, out of faith. The Jews, however, who heard the expression, understood it as it was meant, and were, like you, offended at it: they therefore objected, that he thus made himself "equal with God;" nay, more, "and that thou, being a man, makest thyself God." The Jews, observe, came to the right conclusion, and were induced on this account to reject the premises; they came to the right conclusion, inasmuch as they inferred from the saying of Jesus, that he, as the Son of God, was one with God the Father,—they inferred from this, that he represented himself, as *equal with* God the Father, and indeed, as *God*. But you, on the contrary, draw a wrong inference, declaring, that upon the supposition of Jesus being really the Son of the Father, you are "led into an acknowledgment of *inferiority* on the part of the Son." And, therefore, you also reject the premises. And hence, what with the reasonings of Jew and Gentile, Christ is still as it were crucified betwixt two malefactors, who consent together to rob him of his proper divinity as *the Son* of God.

But in answer to *your* conclusion of inferiority, &c. it is sufficient to remark, that if, as we contend, Father, Son, and Spirit, are by "nature God," they must have been from all eternity what they are now; and there is, and can be, no priority of existence, or superiority of being, in one above or before another, but all the sacred Three, are co-equal and coeval, as the subsisting Alehim in one self-existent Jehovah.

And here let it be well considered, that it is not for erring mortals to enquire as to *how* this is so, or even to attempt to *imagine* the mode or manner of the divine existence. Whatever respects the divine essence is naturally incomprehensible, and its *Unity* is as much so as is its pluripersonality, or, perhaps, more so—and hence, *Polytheism* has been known to obtain in all the great empires of the heathen world, Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman, even during the most enlightened periods of their existence. Even the Jews are constrained to concede this, and to confess "that of the supreme Being we can affirm number of no sort, neither the singular nor yet the plural; but he is one, *without any Unity*." That is, without such Unity as the human intellect can comprehend; whence they remark, that "should you be even ready to divest your mind of every corporeal idea, and to conceive in your imagination any spiritual form, and to fancy in your mind that he is like the form which you have thus conceived in your imagination, notwithstanding

this, you will have no conception nor idea of him at all." So that, both Jew and Gentile, whilst they adhere to reason, and obstinately lean to their own understanding, are only groping in the dark; in their rejection of what is revealed, they may be said to stumble at noonday as in the dark. But you will say, what Priestley said, "that many passages *in Scripture* inculcate the doctrine of the divine unity in the clearest and strongest manner." To which it may be answered in Bishop Horsley's manner—"Be pleased to produce one of the many. I know of no doctrine of the divine unity, taught either in the Old Testament or in the New, but the doctrine, that Jehovah, *the Alehim* (plural) of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the creator of heaven and earth, is the only *true* Alehim, in opposition to the variety of *imaginary* Alehim worshipped by the heathen. Concerning the *metaphysical* unity of the divine nature, the Scriptures are silent; except that by discovering *a Trinity of persons*, they teach clearly what the unity is not, namely, that it is not personal. If you imagine that the absolute unity of the divine substance is more easy to be explained than the Trinity, let me intreat you to read the Parmenides. It is indeed in Plato's school, if any where, that a man's eyes are likely to be opened to his own ignorance. Read the Parmenides; you will then, perhaps, perceive, that that *Unity*, which must be the foundation of all Being, is itself of all things the most mysterious and incomprehensible, I must know more of it than I do, before I can pretend to perceive, what is so clear to you, that you think that I cannot deny it, "that the doctrine of the Trinity looks like an infringement of the unity."

Even Paley, in his *natural* Theology, after defining the deity to be "a Being, infinite, as well in essence as in power, yet, nevertheless, a person," that is, possessed of personality, — acknowledges that there is nothing in nature that goes to restrict this necessary personality to *unity of person*; "certain, however, it is, that the whole argument for the divine Unity, goes no farther than to an *unity of counsel*" (page 390.). Let us then be sober. We are at an utter loss in much lesser matters; "how mind is connected with body, we never have been, and, perhaps, in this state, never shall be able to determine," says a modern Encyclopædia. Speaking of certain effects, it says, "But here we pause, and abandon all attempts at explanation. *How* these things are brought to pass, we cannot say. The speculation, we conceive, is utterly fruitless. We must confess our ignorance, for we really cannot tell why impulse produces vibration, not colour,—or, what is the reason, that vibrations communicated to the ear, are followed by the sensation of sound, and not by that of taste." Surely, this is a somewhat of wisdom amidst our ignorance. And how much reason then have we to submit in spiritual things, not proudly questioning, but believing? "casting down imaginations," or literally, reasonings, "and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God." This is a knowledge, which is only to be acquired from the Word and the Spirit of revelation. And from these we learn that "Jehovah is the true Alehim, he is the Alehim *hayim*,"

that is, "the living ones." (Jer. x. 10.) And so Joshua reminded Israel: "Ye cannot serve Jehovah, for he is the Alehim *kedoshim*," that is, "the *Holy ones*." (xxiv. 19,) And this last quotation but ill accords with Mr. ———'s opinion, namely, that by Alehim is intended the God-man; since it is said, that Jehovah, he is the Alehim; and that the Alehim in Jehovah are so gloriously holy, as to be unapproachable by polluted mortals, save through the intervention of some proper medium. And, therefore, in the cherubic figure, as was intimated in a former letter, there were not only *three* faces or aspects as symbolizing the Alehim, but, likewise, a *fourth*, the face of a *Man*, in union with that of the Lion, one of the other three, as symbolical of the intended incarnation of the Deity, in the person of the Son. I could multiply instances of Hebrew plurals in reference to the true divinity, but this I shall defer until some future occasion, and will pass on to the consideration of *the Sonship* of the Messiah; just premising, indeed, that on this head, as on every other purely revealed truth, it is most easy to start objections, and to propose very difficult, if not unanswerable queries, which go to perplex, not to explain, the agitated question. Should you press upon a Freethinker, the doctrine of the resurrection, he could stop you at once, with, "But *how* are the dead raised up, and with *what body* do they come?" Or if you enforced upon a mere nominal professor of Christianity, the absolute necessity of a spiritual regeneration,—like Nicodemus of old, he could easily reply, "*How* can a man be born when he is old? *how* can these things be?"

It is therefore, far from my intention to aim at showing *how* the Father and the Son co-exist distinctly but indivisibly in a sameness of nature and essence; I have a much easier labour to perform, that of proving the downright matter of fact, of the divine filiation of the Son of God, that inasmuch as *the Spirit of* God is God, so also *the Son of* God is God, without which, indeed, there could be, in this high sense, no God *the Father*. I am not at all concerned with the difficulty which some complain of, in apprehending this truth, since their error lies here, in thinking to apprehend the mode or manner of it, with which they can have nothing to do, but with which they disturb and perplex their minds, instead of embracing it by faith in a childlike way as one of the many mysteries of the revelation of God. You indeed, remark, that it is a "*contradiction* not a mystery." But, surely, you ought to know, that all mysteries of every description involve contradictions in the esteem of unbelief. Talk of the incarnation to a Socinian Unitarian, and he will scoff at it as being contradictory, in that you represent Jesus to be both God and man; he would call it, to repeat the expressions of Dr. Carpenter, on a late occasion, "the unscriptural, and *unintelligible* doctrine of two natures in the person of Christ!" And he is justified in this, upon your principles, since it is purely incomprehensible, just in the same degree that the doctrine of the Trinity is so; and if the Socinian has nothing stronger to object to the incarnation than that it is "unintelligible," it is

all that you can urge in opposition to the other mystery, namely, that, as you yourself express it, "it is a proposition the mind does not seem capable of receiving!"

The statement you have drawn out in Mr. ———'s terms, and which I have quoted above, has nothing new in it; precisely the same objections have been urged and answered times without number. Rabbi J. Crooll, a Jew of the present day, objects "that the one is called the Father, and the other, Son; and who knows not that a Father is always above the Son? and if so, what connexion has the one with the other?" To which lame sort of reasoning how easy is it to retort, that the Son of a man is a man, of one and the same nature with his Father; so that a human father is not above, or superior to his son, but they are so intimately connected as to be "of one blood," and in every respect to possess an absolute identity of nature. This continues to be the case with the offspring of *Adam* down to the present day,—they are now what Adam was almost six thousand years ago; it still holds good, that "all nations are of one blood," and indeed of one heart and spirit, for "as in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man." The Son of God then is truly God by nature, since he is not a Son as men and as angels are, by creation or by adoption, or by office, but he is the eminently *First-begotten*, that is to say, the *sole* or "only-begotten of the Father." And hence the scripture paints him "in the *form* of God," that is, according to the learned Schleusner, in the very nature and essence of Deity in respect of his superior nature; he possesses all the attributes and perfections, which are, so to speak, the *features* of God, and therefore he must be in *the substantial form* of God. The apostle therefore adds that he is "*equal with* God," which was what the Jews objected to him, when Jesus said in their hearing that he was *the Son* of God. Had the Jews erred in their inference, Paul would not have repeated the same expression, and in such a connexion too,— "and being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God," that is, says Schleusner, in nature and majesty. It is thus then that he is the "express image," or the very character and expression, of God; insomuch that he who sees the Son, through the medium of the assumed human nature, *sees the Father*, because, as the Father is God, so is the Son also God, but for which it would be absurd to assert that he who sees the one sees the other. Now, to confirm this, and put it beyond dispute, when *the Son* became born of a woman, or *the Word* made flesh, is it not affirmed that "*God* was manifested in flesh?" And yet we are taught that no one hath "seen *God*" at any time, nor "*can* see" him; that is, as to the naked essence of Deity, which is purely spiritual, invisible, and infinitely immense: but whereas when the Son assumed our nature, he exerted and exhibited the divine perfections, the glory of Jehovah, according to the previous prediction, became revealed, and all flesh, both Jew and Gentile alike, saw it together. Now it is recorded of Jesus, upon his converting water into wine, that he manifested forth *his*, his *own* glory. Here then *God* was manifest in flesh. And John tells us

that he and others "beheld his glory;" but whose? "The glory as of *the only-begotten* of the Father." This was when the manhood was transfigured before them, and, as Peter says, they were "eye-witnesses of *his majesty*" who shot such glory through it.

But certainly, in our contemplations on the Deity, it becomes us to abstract our ideas as much as possible from material things, and to confine them rather to such as are intellectual and spiritual. For want of habituating ourselves to this species of meditation, we are too inclined to imagine respecting Jehovah that he is even such an one as ourselves. So that I have often met with persons, in other respects not uninformed, who have confessed themselves at a loss to conceive of God otherwise than as a corporeal Being,—and the same they have acknowledged respecting the angels. And what had tended to confirm them in such an erroneous, and very unworthy idea, was this,—its being recorded that *man* was made in the image of God, and that the angels in their appearances of old appeared in the form of *men*. Not considering, that those incorporeal spirits, the angelic Beings, could only be rendered visible by the intervention of some material shape; and it was therefore wisely ordered, that in their benevolent intercourse with men they should appear as men. And that the image of God in man is centered in the soul or immaterial spirit, is too obvious, one would think, to escape the notice of the most careless. Externally we are most intimately allied to the beasts that perish; it is the *inner* man, the *mind*, which characterises the human being, and proves him to have been created after the likeness of God. To the mind then we should look for some traces of the Deity; and from an error here, it is now objected by some, that *they* do not expect *to see three different persons in heaven!* Are they not then still carnal? and do they not think as men? And can they at all flatter themselves that an observation so ridiculous will have the least influence upon those who have been accustomed to "the words of soberness and truth?" God, it is averred, no one either *hath* seen or *can* see, in this gross sense. And yet "we shall see God;" but it is the blessedness of "the pure in heart,"—of those whose *thoughts* are sublimated and refined, as well as their affections, through the efficient co-operation of the Spirit and the Word of truth. These will have *an intellectual perception* of the Godhead through the medium of the glorified manhood; and, not of the Godhead only, but of the persons subsisting in it, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And this sublime triad they will adore, saying, "*Holy! holy! holy!*" Let us reflect for an instant, my friend, on that exquisite definition in Scripture, that "God is *a Spirit*,"—or "is Spirit," that is to say, incorporeal, immaterial, and intellectual; and it may hence appear to us, perhaps, that there is nothing irrational even, in the doctrine of the Trinity. Since, in a spiritual Being, we are naturally led to conceive of the distinct subsistence of mind, thought, and energy, in its essence; and although these evident distinctions do not come up to the idea of distinct personalities, such as the Scriptures refer to the Alehim in Jehovah, yet if we consider with

what obvious propriety *the parent mind* may be called the Father, *its offspring thought* the Son, and *the proceeding energy* (essential alike to both, and flowing equally from both) the Spirit,—they will at least suffice to elevate our conceptions of this high mystery beyond the vulgar notions which obtain upon the subject, and to correct the propensity so perceptible in the many of indulging in apprehensions whose tendency is to reduce the Godhead to mere corporeity. Even in the material *sun* we seem to espy a sort of shadow of this glorious truth; and scripture, in the adoption of the metaphor, will countenance our adaptation of it to our present purpose—"Jehovah, the Alehim, is a Sun." For in the refulgent orb of day we confess a parent *fire*, which has in its *light* an offspring coeval with its own existence, and in its *heat*, a proceeding energy which has an all-pervading influence. Now light is the frequent title which the Son assumes; and is not this the essential splendour, glory, and brightness, as well as the express and substantial image, of the parent fire? But notwithstanding, what would be the light itself, if it were to reach us unaccompanied by heat? It would neither quicken, fructify, nor ripen. But the true solar light, bespeaks its high origin in being the constant vehicle of heat, more or less, and so it performs those several functions. Thus it is with the *Son*, when accompanied by the gracious effluence of the *Spirit*,—the soul then feels the mighty effects of that purest and most fervent parent fire, the *Father's love*, and is indeed blessed with the fulfilment of the recorded promise, that "*the Sun* of righteousness shall arise upon us with healing in its beams."

But to return from this unintentional digression. I remember, some three or four years ago, writing a letter to a dissenting minister on this very subject, the nature of the Sonship of our Lord, in reference to his divine person. I had met with a pamphlet of his, against the *Socinian* Unitarians, in the course of which it appeared to me as if he had unwittingly betrayed himself and his cause into the enemy's hands. For he, falling a reasoning, observes, somewhat as you have done, only laying the stress upon priority of existence on the part of the Father, instead of upon superiority of nature, but which is equally inadmissible in the circumstance of an eternal Being, and one that is unalterably and unchangeably so, such as God is,—he observes, that "the term Son includes a relative idea, which implies priority of existence in the Father, and subsequency of existence in the Son. He who is a Father, must, as a Father, necessarily be older than his Son. It therefore does not appear, that any Being, who is a Son, can, as a Son be eternal. The term Son, as applied to Jesus Christ, comprehends his incarnation; but, according to our present conceptions, it cannot comprehend his Divinity; nor do I recollect a single expression, throughout any part of the Bible, in which the term *Son* is applied to Jesus Christ, unless it has reference to his incarnate state." You see, in this, the besetting sin of man! "vain man would be wise, though man be born a wild ass's colt." We call in the aid of reason,—judge of God from what we perceive in the creatures,—and then set about

fashioning a creed "according to our present conceptions!" I think I perceive at least *three* mistakes in the above statement. 1st. A Father must not, as a Father, necessarily be older than his Son; so far from this, a Father, as a Father, has no existence in a separation from his Son. He never was a Father, until he had a Son; and he is as dependent upon his Son for his paternal character, as his Son is dependent upon him for his Filiation. 2dly, Carrying this idea on to God, who is at once eternal, and immutably the same from and to everlasting, it does appear that a Being who is a Son, provided he be the Son *of God*, the proper *begotten* Son of God the Father, can, and indeed must, even as a Son, be eternal; not after the manner of carnal generation, as some are wont to dream, but after a manner consistent with a spiritual, immaterial, intellectual, infinite, and eternal Being, who is, whatever he is, naturally and necessarily, and in whom therefore there always subsisted the same personal distinctions as are now revealed to us in the name of *Father* and *Son* and Spirit. And, 3dly, The term Son, as applied to Jesus Christ, so far from cannot, certainly may, and does, comprehend his Divinity; that is to say, it bespeaks him a divine person, equal to the Father, and one with him in nature, essence, and perfections; nor are parts of scripture wanted, to establish this position.

This then brings me to the main subject,—the proof of the point from holy writ.

You recollect that because he made himself "the Son of God," it was, that Jesus incurred the displeasure of the Jews. They rightly judged in concluding that he thus became God's "Equal," or "Fellow," and consequently, "God." Yet in this he did not blaspheme, being naturally possessed of the essential "Image" and substantial "Form" of God.

When John informs us that "the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour," he very strongly enforces the proper Divinity of the Son, since no other than one of the Alehim in Jehovah, one of those *three* persons who are *one* Godhead, can save. As the Son of man Jesus himself required salvation, and is represented as appealing to him who could "save him from death;" he learnt this submission in his incarnate state, "*though* he were *a Son*," the Son of the Most High, and "Lord of all," that is to say, Jehovah. Therefore, the *Son*, if this implies his *manhood*, could no more be the Saviour of the world than Adam or Abel could. This the Jews assert, and fairly plead, that it is said of the Messiah as a man, that "he is just, and *saved*," that is, having salvation extended to himself (Zech. ix. 9). And amongst other texts, they quote the following, to demonstrate the absolute Divinity of him who saves—"And all flesh shall know, that I *Jehovah*, am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer" (Isa. xlix. 26). And that such an one is the Son sent, to be the Saviour, is obvious from that in the same prophet,—"Jehovah shall send them a Saviour, even a *great one*," that is, *rub*, one of the *rubim* or majestic ones, the Alehim in Jehovah; and he shall deliver them." Accordingly, he proclaims himself by this name further on in the same prophetic book,—"I who publish righteousness, *the mighty one* (rub) to save!" (Isa. xix. 20; lxiii. 1).

In the second Psalm, ages anterior to his incarnation, the prophetic Spirit directed the church to Jehovah in the person of "the Son;" since, although not as yet invested with humanity, he even then sustained the character and fulfilled the office of Mediator, which no inferior being could possibly have undertaken. He is not then the Son, because of his official capacity, but being the Son of God he therefore interposed between offending sinners and his offended Father. And it is remarkable to observe how very near the truth the Jewish writers come, in an ancient comment of theirs upon this delightful scripture. In Medrash Tillim, it is said,—"Kiss the Son;" this is like to a king wroth with his subjects, who therefore persuaded the king's Son to reconcile his Father with them. After the reconciliation made, the subjects went to give thanks to the king; but he said to them, Do you give me thanks? *Go and thank my Son*, for but for him I should have destroyed you! And this is what is meant by—"Kiss the Son."

It was "the Son of God" who displayed his omnipotence in the preservation of the three Hebrew youths in the midst of Nebuchadnezzar's fiery furnace. He appeared on this occasion in the form of a man, as, whenever the angels have appeared on earth, they have done the same. But he is not therefore *the Son of God*, because he assumed the semblance of a *Son of man*,—this would be a strange conclusion; but being essentially the Son of God, and officially the Saviour of God's chosen people, he made an open display of himself as "a Saviour, and a great one," for the rescue of these his faithful adherents: and, possibly, in mercy to the Babylonish monarch, who might thus have ocular demonstration of the truth of the doctrine which had been previously proposed to him by Daniel. For that the idea was not novel to the king is plain, since, at the instant when discovering a fourth amid the raging flames, he exclaimed, "and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." At any rate, his appearing in this peculiar manner would tend to revive the hope, and to confirm the faith of every true Israelite, and to assure them of the certainty of the Son of God eventually becoming the Son of man for the redemption and the consolation of his people.

In the predictions of Isaiah, if a virgin conceives and bears a Son, the name of the Son is *El* or God; that is to say, being previously *God* in himself, he becomes, when incarnated, Emanu-el, or God *with us*. For if it be true, that God sends forth his Son, according to the expression of St. Paul, and that his Son so sent becomes by incarnation "God with us,"—he must have been *El* before he could be *Emanu-El*; or else, if he was not essentially God *in himself*, how is it possible that his being born of a virgin could make him to be God *with us?* Supposing the notion of the pre-existence of the human soul of Jesus to be admitted, and that when the Father is said to have sent the Son, it is only meant that *God* sent forth this previously created *soul* to take possession of a fleshly body prepared for it,—how would this do more than constitute Jesus *a proper man?* How could the junction of a soul with its intended body ac-

count for the name Emanu-El, *God* with us? But if we discard this flimsy fancy, and adhere by faith to the celestial record, which tells us that the Son of God was sent forth by God the Father, in a way, observe, consistent with the Deity, and consequently incomprehensible to us, but correspondent to what is also recorded of the Holy Spirit, that he is *sent*, and that he *descends*, and *comes*, &c. which kind of language obtains likewise, in the Old Testament in allusion to *Jehovah*,—then, it is manifest, how he who had been *El* from all eternity, as one of the Alehim, the Holy Ones, became *Emanu*-El in time, through the assumption of our nature. And, agreeably to this idea, Isaiah in a subsequent chapter, says, That a child is born, and that a Son is given, and "his name shall be called, The mighty God," that is to say, El-gebur, which would admit of being rendered the *God-man*. Now, his birth of the virgin, plainly makes him to be a man, in all things like his brethren, sin excepted, and, in the sense in which men and angels are so denominated, Jesus might thus be called, the Son of God; but, nothing of this description would make him *God*, even *the mighty* God. We must, therefore, acknowledge him to be the very Son of the Father, and so by nature, *El* or *God*, and that in time he took part of our frail humanity, and by this act became El *gebur*, or the God-*man*; and thus "*God* was manifest in the *flesh*."

An immense stress is laid upon the Sonship of Jesus throughout the scriptures. When John speaks of the glory of the creating Word made flesh, he explains it as being "the glory as of *the only-begotten* of the Father," that is, the only *Son*. And, at the instant when Peter heard him acknowledged by the Father, for his "beloved Son," then it was that they were eye-witnesses of his *majesty*. And in the first preaching of Paul and others, what was their favourite topic? They "preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God;" this point they urged upon the Jews, although the very truth for which the Jews condemned him. Herein is the greatness of the love of God, that he gave "his only-*begotten* Son;" and the infidel's condemnation is this, "because he hath not believed in the *name* of the only-begotten Son of God." Jesus was wont to enquire, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" And when Peter confessed him to be the Son of the living God, Jesus answered, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona! for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven;" which passage, with many others, goes to show, that, personally considered, it was not the *Father* who became incarnate, but *the Son*, of whom it is written, in order to prove his omnipresence as God, that "*he is* in heaven," at the instant when his bodily presence was confined to the earth (John iii. 13). All men are to honour the *Son* even as they honour the *Father;* so that he who honoureth not the Son as God, is deficient here, and honoureth not the Father aright in respect of his paternal character. Honouring the Father as God, it follows, that we are to honour the Son as God also, that we may preserve unimpaired the

divinity of both the filial and the paternal name; and hence, that we may know what is the honour intended, when the Father brings in the first-begotten into the world, he says, "Let all the angels of God *worship* him." This is a quotation from the ninety-seventh Psalm—"The hills melted like wax at the presence of Jehovah, at the presence of the Adon of the whole earth. The heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people see his glory. Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols; worship *him*," the Adon Jehovah, "all ye Alehim," or, as the Septuagint renders it, and from it the apostle, "all ye his angels." A passage, which incontestibly proves the plurality of the term Alehim, it being applied to the angels as the ministers of the persons in Jehovah, who are "the *true* Alehim," (Jer. x. 10.) even "the living Alehim," that is, *hayim* in the plural, "the Alehim the living ones."

I cannot but consider the denial of the divine Sonship of Messiah, as being the main feature of the antichrist of scripture. It is too common to look upon the pope as being antichrist. He is certainly St. Paul's man of sin, and so on, (2 Thess. ii. 3—12. and 1 Tim. iv. 1—8. but this will not prove him to be the peculiar antichrist of St. John. That of which Paul spoke, was not then actually "revealed," but he spoke prophetically of that "mystery of iniquity" which should afterwards arise by gradual advances in papal Rome. But the antichrist of St. John, who alone describes this character indeed, was already in the world; and against this, as an evil then extant, the beloved apostle aims his shafts throughout his Gospel and Epistles. And what is antichrist? John defines him in a word—"Ye have heard that antichrist shall come; even now are there many antichrists: *he* is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son!" Hence then, the reason of his dwelling so much on the divinity of Jesus as the *Son* and the *Word* of God; and here lies the force of what he adds at the conclusion of his first epistle,—"his *Son* Jesus Christ; this," this "*Person* is the true *God* and eternal life. Little children! keep yourselves from *idols*." He says, also, with manifest emphasis, "We have seen, and do testify, that *the Father* sent *the Son* to be the Saviour of the world;" and, "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." Now, the papists, bad as they are, never denied the Father and the Son; and therefore, they are not, strictly speaking, antichrist. But all Unitarians are! So that there are now, as then, *many* antichrists, who in one way or another "confess not that Jesus Christ (as the Son of God) is come in the flesh; and this is that spirit of antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world." They are represented by the apostle as springing up within the enclosure of the church, even as tares in the midst of the wheat; for, he adds, that "they went out from us, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us, but that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." The only remaining notice of antichrist is as follows,

"Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh; this is a deceiver and an antichrist. Whoso transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of *Christ*, hath not *God*." Now "he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath *both the Father and the Son*." Whereas, "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father; but he that acknowledgeth the Son, hath the Father also." Of such importance is this doctrine, respecting *the Father and the Son*, that the apostle immediately subjoins the following caution: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds." (2 John 3—11.)

Countenanced by the above authorities, we appear to be justified in adducing the trinal name in Matthew, of "*Father*, and *Son*, and Spirit," as a proper appellation of the Alehim of eternity. And to this must be added the record of St. John, who testifies of *three* that bear witness in heaven, "the *Father*, and *Word*, and Spirit." But in what sense is the second of these called the Son, and the Word? Do these titles refer to the Manhood? or to a divine person, the second mode of subsistence in the Godhead? You would restrict them to the manhood; but since the scripture declares the Son to be God, and the Word to be God, I dare not do other than believe the Son to be even he who *spoke*, and the universe sprung into being. He being the *Son* of the Father, declared the Father's will, and hence he is called the *Word*. But let the point be determined by such authority as cannot be resisted.

"Unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art *my Son*, this day have *I begotten thee!* But when he bringeth the first-*begotten* into the world, he saith, Let all the angels of God worship him. And of the angels, he saith, Who maketh his angels Spirits; but unto *the Son*, Thy throne, *O God*, is for ever and ever." This cannot be spoken of any thing human, it expressly asserts the superiority of the Son to all the angels; and not such a superiority only as one creature might have above another,—but, precisely such as the Creator possesses; for it declares the Son to be *God*, and to be accordingly, the legitimate object of religious *worship*. This passage so annoyed our Socinian Unitarians, that in their new version of the New Testament, they translated the clause, "Thy throne, O God," thus, "God is thy throne." This ingenious turn so tickled the fancy of Dr. Carpenter, that he celebrated this notable piece of criticism, both from the pulpit and the press, as one of *the most important improved renderings*. But upon its being hinted that they had overshot their mark, in that they had unwittingly made the Son, instead of inferior, superior to God the Father, inasmuch as the enthroned is greater than the throne itself, the Doctor *then* perceived, and confessed, that the idiom of the Greek forbids such a flagrant perversion of the sense of the inspired author.

As *the Word*, Jesus is likewise declared to be God: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, *and the Word was God*; and the Word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst

us; and we beheld *his* glory, the glory as of *the Only-begotten* of the *Father*." It appears, then, that the appropriate name of the second subsistence in Jehovah is that of *the Son*, for this marks the relation the second stands in to the first, namely, the Father. Accordingly, he is also called the *first* born or begotten, in a way of eminence, or what the Greeks term κατ' εξοχην; and he is styled the *only* Son and *only*-begotten, to shew that his filiation has respect to the paternity of the first mode of subsistence, which is not the case with the Sonships of men or angels, who are only sons of God, in a way of creation, regeneration, adoption, or office, &c. And then the Son is called *the Word*, as declaring the Father's purposes, who is said to have "*spoken by* the Son;" and, likewise, as having created all things by his mere fiat, or *ipse dixit*, "He spoke, and it was."

Let me implore you, as you value truth for its own sake, and as it concerns your eternal destiny, to give these scriptures all possible attention. No force nor artifice has been used; no attempt made to corrupt the Word of God, or to wrest it from its obvious meaning. The prophets, evangelists, and apostles, have not suffered violence; they have not been put upon the rack of invention, nor subjected to the tortures of criticism, merely to extort an involuntary confession. I have done no more, than selected for your consideration those several texts, in two of which are specified three distinct personal agents, the second of whom is called *the Son* and *the Word*; and in the other texts, this Son, who is likewise named the Word, is declared to be God, to be God with God; that is, personally considered, as the Son in distinction from the Father, and he is represented as the divine majesty enthroned eternally in heaven. To complete this mass of proof for the divine Sonship of the Messiah, I shall conclude with producing authority for his having been *the Creator*.

This, no creature can be, in any sense; the nature of creation excludes the idea of any instrumental cause. Jehovah may transact other affairs by delegation, and have recourse to the ministrations of men and angels, but *to give Being*, or to cause to exist, is the sole prerogative, and the immediate act, of essential Deity. And, therefore, the meaning of the incommunicable name Jehovah, is, that he exists of himself, and that he is the sole cause of existence to all else; and bearing this sense, it is necessarily incommunicable to any but God. For, whoever creates, he only is God, and whatever is created is not God. But the Son is God, the Word is God, and so, not a creature; and if not a creature, then he is the Creator. You cannot join these together. You must make the Son the Word, to be God the creator, or else, the man the creature. Now the places quoted above, absolutely aver the Son to be God, the Word to be God, and that he acted the part of creator. And, therefore, your Sabellian idea, of a created soul being the agent in the formation of the universe of worlds, is indefensible; it is as contrary to revelation as it is to the sober dictates of right reason. It is making that to be Jehovah, which yet is not so. For you say that it is a human soul, and, nevertheless,

that it performed the office of creator. It is true, that the *Alehim* co-operated in creating, and they are therefore called *ashim* and *boraim* in the Hebrew, that is, *makers* and *creators*, but then these Alehim are not, as you imagine, the essence of deity and a human soul in conjunction, but *they are Jehovah.* "Jehovah, He is the Alehim; Jehovah, He is the Alehim, (1 Kings xviii. 39.) And, therefore, he says to his people; "See now, that I, I am the He," that is, *hava*, or Jehovah, "and no Alehim *with me*," none joined to me, or united with me, that are not essentially *of* me, and so *Jehovah*, (Deut. xxxii. 39).

But let us hasten to the proof, that nothing that is not essentially Jehovah did create. Turn to Nehemiah ix. 6. and read it with the omission of the italics; "*Thou* Jehovah *thyself*, thyself *alone*, thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host,—the earth, and all things that are thercin,—the seas, and all that is therein; *and thou* preservest them all; and the host of heaven worshippeth *thee*. *Thou* art Jehovah *the Alehim*," ha-alehim, with the emphatic article prefixed. I could add many such proofs, but having produced a multitude in my Tract on Sabellian Unitarianism, which you have seen, this makes it superfluous to amplify here; this passage was not quoted there. And what encouragement does it give you? It excludes every thing from the work of creation but Jehovah, Jehovah himself, even himself alone; and it declares the Alehim to be Jehovah. Consequently, if the Son or Word is said to have created, he must, essentially, be Jehovah, and *personally* one of the Alehim in the ineffable Godhead. But he is said to have *created*, to uphold and *preserve* all things, and to be *worshipped* by the host of heaven; which are the particulars predicated of Jehovah in the above quotation.

As proofs of the Son's creatorship, &c. we have only to refer to the first chapter of the Hebrews, from the first to the sixth verse of which the apostle introduces him, in distinction from the Father, as the creator of the world, as the upholder of all things, and as an object of adoration to the angels. In the subsequent part of the chapter, from the eighth to the twelfth verse, he is called God, as *the Son*, distinct from the *Father*, and Lord or Jehovah; is said to have originally created the earth and the heavens; and is represented, in the contrast with the evanescent nature of all merely created things, as being himself unchangeable and eternally "the same."

In the first chapter of the Colossians, the Son is introduced as the firstborn, that is to say, both Son and heir, who creates and inherits all, "For by him were all things created; all things were created *by him*, (as the co-equal Son of the Father), and *for him* (as heir), and he is before all things (that is, eternal, a parte ante), and by him all things consist."

The same things are predicated of him as *the Word*, that is, as the Son speaking, declaring, revealing, or commanding, &c. In the thirty-third Psalm, it is said, that "the heavens were made by the *dabar*, or *logos*, or *Word* of Jehovah; for *he spake*, and it was, *he commanded*, and it stood fast."

For Paul tells you, in the first of the Hebrews, that God speaks by, or in the person of the Son. And that he is, as distinct from God the Father, not the first creature, but a divine person, and so one divinity with the Father and the Spirit by an identity of nature, John teaches us plainly in the first chapter of his Gospel. "The Word was, in the beginning." The Word was then "with God." And the Word himself "was God." And to demonstrate his eternal power and Godhead, the Evangelist goes on to attribute all creation to this person, whom he also calls, in the course of the same chapter, *the Son* of God, the *Only begotten* of the Father, and the only *begotten Son* who is in the bosom of the Father. "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." And Peter tells us that by the Word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth; but the heavens and the earth (*by the same Word*) are kept in store."

You will admit, perhaps, that Dr. Carpenter is a good judge of what makes for or against his favourite Unitarianism. Now he thought it necessary to destroy the sense of John's declaration, that "the world was made by him," that is, by the Son or Word; because *he* is not so ignorant as to imagine any being short of essential deity as capable of sustaining the character of Creator. He therefore renders it, "the world was *enlightened* by him!" This he confesses, is not in the original, but to be deduced from the context. This however suits the passage badly, since the adjoining sentence is a contradiction to such an assertion, "and the world *knew him not:*" how then was the world *enlightened* by him? But this suggested no difficulty to the Doctor, who in another attempt at an improvement of the received translation, introduces the expression of *invisible light*, which is a good parallel to *enlightened ignorance*. He substitutes for, "she is the brightness of the *everlasting light*," which is spoken of wisdom, in the apocryphal book of that name,—"she is a ray of *invisible* light." This mistake arose from a misconception as to the origin of the Word. The very supposition, Mr. Veysin remarks in reply, of invisible light, is manifestly absurd. We have all admired the boldness of the poet, who ventured to speak of *darkness visible*; but who before ever thought of *light invisible*? But it is thus that the Lord turns the counsels and conceits of those Ahithophels into foolishness.

Your's, &c.

R. H. C.

## DIALOGUES BETWEEN A JEW AND HIS TEACHER.

[*Continued from page 343.*]

### CHAPTER V.

*Sorrow for sin; true faith; and the recovery of the soul from the disease of sin.*

*Rabbi. M.* My dear brother, I rejoice to see you look so extraordinarily cheerful; your countenance is quite brightened up.

*Samuel.* Thanks to you, under God, and to the excellent instructions you instilled into my heart. Yes, dear Rabbi, my fears, my tormenting fears are gone. They have made room for a calm confidence and filial love to my God, of

whose love to us poor sinners I can now no longer doubt, since the king Messiah has been bruised for our sakes, when all we were straying like sheep, since it has pleased our heavenly father to make his wounds our healing. Oh how this calls for the gratitude of poor sinners! Now, better than ever, do I understand, and more fervently than ever do I take into my mouth, that prayer composed by the men of the great assembly, "May it be thy pleasure, O Lord my God, and my father's God, to let me habitually be employed in thy law, and cleave to thy commandments. Lead me not into sin, transgression or iniquity; nor into temptation; nor into contempt. Let not the evil will prevail over me. Remove me far from evil men, and evil company. Let me abide by the good will, and in good works, yea, constrain my affections to be subject unto thee."

*Rab. M.* This, my brother, yes this is the way, walk thou in it.—In Sepher Ir Haggibborim it is well said,* "The word of God is kept by him only that killeth himself, that is to say, slayeth the power of his lusts." And if you will love God you know what is incumbent upon us.

*Sam.* "Ye that love God," says David, (Ps. xcvii.) "hate that which is evil."

*Rab. M.* Those who are enabled to taste, in the fear of God, how good and gracious he is, who, like you, view his love in cancelling our sins by the sufferings of king Messiah—I say such persons will not find loving God supremely an hard task, but a pleasant and most delightful exercise of their souls.

---

*Sam.* Surely the word of God must have given us clear instructions, about the person of one so dear and precious as king Messiah, who is to save Israel by his own griefs from all their sins, sorrows, diseases and misery. Now you have been reading and explaining to me in our former conversations both out of Isaiah and the Yalkut, how that Israel is to be saved by the *Lord himself* with an everlasting salvation—

*Rab. M.* And yet I shall be guilty of no contradiction, my dear friend, when I now assert, with Rashi,* that Israel shall be redeemed and saved by *king Messiah* with an everlasting salvation. For, though we are accustomed to style him *Messiah* our Righteousness, the word of God calls him (Jer. xxiii. 6.) "The *Lord (Jehovah)* our Righteousness."

*Sam.* [*After reading the passage.*] Are our learned men agreed about the rendering and meaning of this passage?

*Rab. M.* No; some trans-

---

* Page 19, column 4.

* See his commentary on the words ונצדק קדש Daniel 8. 14.

late it, "The Lord shall call him, Our righteousness," and others, "The Lord *is* our righteousness." The first of these versions dismembers the phrase, "Lord our Righteousness," by making the word *Lord* the nominative of the verb *he shall call*, and is refuted by the constant vote of the Masorah which has placed *conjunctive** accents under this and all similar phrases, to guard, perhaps, against this very error. The latter version, viz, "the Lord *is* our Righteousness," is guilty of an unwarrantable interpolation, since the literal rendering, namely, "The Lord our Righteousness," is perfectly intelligible without the word *is* between.† Nor is there any contradiction in Messiah's bearing the name of Jehovah, since the Shechinah‡ is to be united with him in the closest and most intimate union.

*Sam.* Have our Doctors observed this name of king Messiah?

*Rab. M.* It did not escape their attention. In the larger paraphrase on the Lamentations§ it is asked, "What is the name of Messiah?" upon which Abba son of Cahna replies, "Jehovah is his name; for it is written, 'And this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.'" To the same effect are the words of Rabbi Alshech,* "And who will He be that shall thus call on Jerusalem to comfort her, according to that exhortation, 'Speak to the heart† of Jerusalem and call on her.' (Isa. xl. 2.)? Is it not He, even Jehovah our Righteousness, the king Messiah, as it is written Jer. xxiii. 6. and *he* (Messiah) is (Jehovah) *from his righteous and just conduct.*" You see then that Rabbi Alshech understands more than a mere name in this appellation of Messiah; he conceives it given to him by right, as nothing more than due, for he says and *he* is (Jehovah) *from his righteous and just conduct.*

*Sam.* And is this name given to none besides the Messiah?

*Rab. M.* To none other. Some indeed cavil and say that it is given to the righteous as a body, and to Jerusalem, but there is no just foundation for this assertion, and therefore the last mentioned judicious commentator rejects it in these words,‡ "Probably the company of the righteous are never styled by the name of God himself; else what excellence is it for Messiah to be called

---

* וזה־שמו אשר־יקראו יהוה צדקנו Thus Exod. xvii. 15. ויקרא שמו יהוה נסי; thus again Ezek. xlviii. 35. ושם־העיר מיום יהוה שמה In these two latter instances the insertion of the word *is* may be justified, as by omitting it we shall absurdly (I ought to say blasphemously) apply the name of the Deity, to a stone or city.

† See the preceding note.

‡ See Expositor, July, p. 258. second note.

§ איכה רבתי page 65.

* In his commentary on Jerem. xxxiii. page 98. col. 2.

† See marginal reading.

‡ On Isa. xlii, page 36. col. 3.

so, for none doubts that he is less than any righteous man in Israel."

*Sam.* We have read in the Yalkut, "He shall be exalted *above* every righteous man, he shall be higher than Abraham and Moses."*

*Rab. M.* And yet we know that the Shechinah rested upon those patriarchs. The consequence will land us upon a great and holy mystery. Israel shall indeed be saved with an everlasting salvation by Jehovah, that is, according to Rashi,† by the king Messiah, or, according to the Targum, ‡ by the Word (Memra) of Jehovah.

*Sam. King Messiah* is, in this view, the same as the *Word of the Lord*, and—

*Rab. M.* Let us first collect from another passage of the Targum, what person we are to understand under this expression, the Word of the Lord. On Judges vi. 12, 13. he paraphrases thus, "And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him, and said unto him, The *Word* § *of the Lord* be thy helper, thou man of valour. And Gideon answered him, And is then, I pray thee, my Lord, the *Shechinah of the Lord* our helper, Why then did all this happen unto us?" You see then that the *Shechinah* is synonymous with the *Word*, and the *Word*, you have already well observed, is the same as *Messiah*.

*Sam.* I have now a glance at the great mystery, and bless God for it. Well is thee, O Israel, who is like unto thee, O people saved by the Jehovah Messiah himself!

*Rab. M.* Hear, my brother, an observation of Rabbi Ami* on this passage, "It is not written saved *unto* but saved *by* the Lord: when a man has a measure of Second Tithes,† what does he do? he gives its value in money and the measure is redeemed *by* the money: in the same manner (if we may compare great things with small) Israel is redeemed, by what? *by* Jehovah himself! a people saved *by* the Lord!"

---

*Sam.* Oh, with what joy and love can I now say, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord OUR God is one Lord. Blessed be his glorious and royal name for ever and ever. Thou shalt love the Lord THY God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength.‡

---

* See Expositor, July, page 254.

† See second note on this chapter.

‡ On Isa. xlv. 17.

§ The Unitarians would have us translate, מימרא דיי *the Lord himself*; but they only say it *may* be translated so (Belsham's Calm Enquiry). They should substantiate their assertion with proofs, and then they might use bolder language, such as, "it admits of no other translation," till they do that, we must be permitted to abide by the plain literal meaning of מימרא

* Yalkut, part ii. page 577.

† מעשר שני, which could only be eat at Jerusalem.

‡ These words occur in that part of the Jewish Liturgy called *Keriath Shema*, which is held most sacred by the Jews, and repeated by every pious Jew twice a day.

*Rab. M.* As you are upon this part of Keriath Shema, let me read to you a passage from the Zohar, on the sublime mystery we are contemplating.* "Behold they are three names (Jehovah—our God—Jehovah) how then are they one? As they are called "One" (אחד) so they are one indeed, but comprehended only in the view of the Holy Ghost. And that those Three are One may be shewn by the mystery of the voice, which, though one, has three substances, fire, wind, and water: in the same manner *Jehovah, our God, Jehovah* are one, i. e. three subsistencies that are one." To the same effect speaks this sublime Author in other places.†

*Sam.* I do believe all that the word of God teaches us of our heavenly Father, and of the Word, and of his Spirit, and that according to the explanations given by our own Rabbis, I believe that he is a Being subsisting in distinct degrees, which, as the Zohar says, is a sacred mystery far above our poor comprehension, but surely not to be rejected on that account.

*Rab. M.* Simple belief in, and reliance on the word of God is a gift communicated by God, as is said in Sepher Lekach Tov.‡ Now what we have spoken of his blessed Being, of Redemption, and the gathering of our captivity, with other points, are so many objects of this faith and reliance.

*Sam.* What you now say, my dear Rabbi, I do not take upon the authority of the Lekach Tov, but upon what I feel at this present moment within my own soul. For I feel a contrition, a dependance, a trust, a joy, and a love towards God, to every one of which I was a stranger hitherto. I can rejoice with a contrite and broken heart before my God that he has graciously pardoned my sins, and promised, yea procured eternal life for me. I can trust my salvation to his mercy and the merits of Messiah and depend for my daily bread upon his bounty. Such was not always the state of my soul. He, he alone, therefore, is the cause of this delightful change.

---

*Rab. M.* Since it cannot be questioned but that Messiah has taken our sins upon himself, do you think that he has thereby discharged you from the duty of living a holy life, and procured you license to continue in the sinful vanities and pleasures of the world?

*Sam.* Far from it. My confidence has a far different tendency: it will alienate my heart, I trust, more and more from those vanities and those pleasures, and endear to it the service of God above every thing. If good happens to me I will look up with gratitude to the blessed Giver of it; if evil, I will remember how cheerfully the Messiah has ta-

* Ed. Cremona, page 18. cols. 3. 4.
† On Bereshith, page 18. col. 3.
‡ א שאלה

ken upon him our sorrows, in order that not one of Israel might perish, as we have read in the Yalkut.

*Rab. M.* This will be a conduct responsive to that excellent maxim of piety, "Whatever God does he does for the best." And then, my brother, never forget that love to our God is intimately connected, on the one side, with that species of fear which a dutiful child has of offending his beloved father, and, on the other, with that love to all mankind which brethren bear (or ought to bear) each other.

*Sam.* You utter the very sentiments of my bosom. All mankind are the work of his hands, ought not we then to love them, and do them all the good in our power, in short to deal by them, as we would wish to be dealt by ourselves.* Nay, my very enemies I will by the help of God endeavour to love, much less will I harbour revenge and malice, envy and hatred, in my heart against any person, or commit sin when I am in want. For patience also, we Israelites especially have occasion in our captivity: oh how sweet to know that the far severer yoke of iron has been borne by Messiah our Righteousness!

*Rab. M.* Blessed mayest thou be in the name of the Lord! blessed art thou and well is thee, and blessed is the Lord who has not left his mercy and truth from those that are willing to walk in his way. Would but each of our brethren ponder these things, and return unto the Lord, then would he soon gather our outcasts from the four corners of the earth. Yes, my dear brother, great is my joy over you, as great almost as was the joy of our fathers when they went to draw water on the last day of the feast.* For I see that you are an upright character, not uttering, as many do, empty professions. You are to know there are those who follow every lust and iniquity, and comfort themselves with their Christ, who, they say, has suffered for their sins. They, in fact, adopt the impious language of the sinners in Jeremiah's time, (Jer. vii. 10.) "We are delivered to do all these abominations."

*Sam.* And their priests, who cannot but know their evil works and wicked lives, dispense to them nevertheless absolution of sins in the name of Christ.

*Rab. M.* Those priests have their prototypes in the Scriptures as well as their people, (Jer. xxiii. 17.) "They say still unto them that despise me, The Lord hath said, Ye shall have peace; and they say unto every one that walketh after

* מה דסני עלך לחברך לא תעביד.

* שמחת בית השואבה This ceremony took place on the last day of the feast of Tabernacles. The festivity and mirth was so great on these occasions, that it became proverbial to denote any extreme joy. כל מי שלא ראה שמחת בית השואבה לא ראה שמחה מומיו: Masechath Succah, chap. Cha bl

the imagination of his own heart, No evil shall come upon you." Read likewise the 14th verse of the same chapter.

*Sam.* "I have seen also in the prophets of Jerusalem an horrible thing: they commit adultery, and walk in lies: they strengthen also the hands of evil doers, that none doth return from his wickedness; they are all of them unto me as Sodom, and the inhabitants thereof as Gomorrah."

*Rab. M.* Wonder then no longer, my brother, that such characters hate our nation, and deride our hope of redemption. Such, however, is not the conduct prescribed to them in their code of religion, which they call *Evangelion* (gospel.)

*Sam.* Pray, I have often heard this name, and should like to know the root of this matter, what are the doctrines of this Evangelion, and what is to be thought of it?

*Rab. M.* We must defer this subject to another opportunity, as it would immoderately lengthen our discourse. But before we part let us enquire further into our former subject, viz. repentance. Conjoined with forgiveness of sins it is considered in Scripture as the healing of the soul. Thus D. Kimchi* says, "As a wound of the body is healed by medicine, so sin, the wound of the soul, is healed by pardon and repentance."

*Sam.* If I understand you aright, repentance is therefore comparable to the recovery of the soul, because it renews the heart and spirit of the man; as we have learned before from Ezek. xviii. 31.

*Rab. M.* Exactly so; for a recovery necessarily supposes a renewal. But the means of the soul's recovery are also taught under other images, such as the "sprinkling of clean water," which image reminds me of a remarkable passage in the smaller paraphrase of Genesis,* "'He shall bind his young colt to the vine:' this is he of whom it is said, 'He is poor and rideth upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass,'† even he of whom again it is written, (Jer. ii. 21.) "*I* have planted thee a noble vine;' and how does he perform this? (planting) by 'sprinkling clean water upon them' so as to purify them 'from all their uncleannesses.' (Ezek. xxxvi. 25.)"

*Sam.* Cleanse us thus, O Lord, and put thy spirit into our hearts, and make us to walk in thy statutes and keep thy judgments according to thy promise.

*Rab. M.* Amen; and may that promise of his also soon be accomplished in our nation, which is recorded Jer. xxxi. 31—33.

*Sam.* Permit me to repeat it. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Ju-

* On Jer. iii. 22.

* בראשית קטנא

† Rashi notes on this passage of Zechariah, "It is impossible to apply this scripture to any but king Messiah."

dah; Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day *that* I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt; (which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord;) But this *shall be* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people."

*Rab. M.* Thus far. In the mean time let us earnestly pray that the import of these gracious words may be felt and experienced by ourselves. Israel at that blessed time will have cause to address their Lord, their king Messiah, in the soft sweet strain of David. (Ps. xxiii. 5.) "Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies thou anointest my head with oil, my cup runneth over." Rabbi Hillel indeed says,* that that time was past, and that they had enjoyed Messiah already in the days of Hezekiah. This however, is certainly not true. Israel have yet to enjoy him. Israel have yet to taste and see that he is gracious, and that happy is the man and the nation that trust in him; the time is yet to come when those prophetic words of Moses will be fully realized, "Blessed art thou, O Israel; who is like unto thee, O people, saved by the Lord!"

* Sanhedrin, Perek Chelek.

## ON THE SIGN OF THE SON OF MAN.

*To the Editors of the Jewish Expositor.*

Gentlemen,

In studying the pages of prophecy, we have two rules to follow: First, to search diligently what is revealed, to use it for our profit, and to expect a blessing from perusing and meditating upon it; Secondly, to beware that we advance not beyond what is written, and do not put forward our own determinations for divine prophecy.

Following these rules, I will submit a few remarks on what our blessed Lord and his apostle John say respecting his "coming in the clouds of heaven." Matthew xxiv. 30. Our Lord says, "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Rev. i. 7. "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him."

The first remark which occurs in regard to this description, is, that it manifestly differs from that coming described in a preceding verse, Matthew xxiv. 27.—it differs in the manner and in the effects; in *the manner*, as the latter escapes observation from its rapidity, until the effect is produced, but the former is permanent

and visible to the whole earth; in *the effects*, as the coming as lightning has its effect on the overthrow of hostile armies, whence a carnage is produced, inviting birds and eagles to come together to devour; but the coming in clouds causes all the earth to mourn, and is attended by messengers, who go forth to gather the elect from the four quarters of the world.

Are we not justified then, in concluding, that after the destruction of the army of Antichrist in Judea, there will be a heavenly sign exhibited to all the earth, affecting their hearts in the most powerful manner?

This will first begin at Jerusalem, according to the words of the prophet Zechariah; "And it shall come to pass, in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem, and I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn."

The messengers that go forth to all nations, declaring what has been done in Judea, and accompanied by the heavenly vision, will be truly apostles, according to our Lord's former commands; "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore, into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," "the Lord attending the word with signs following." But now the message is of a particular kind, "Go to every nation, preach the gospel of repentance and faith to Jew and Gentile, calling to the former to return to Jerusalem, and the latter to aid them."

If we suppose, as the words of prophecy import, that the heavenly vision of the Son of man is seen by all the world, we can understand all that is said of the rapidity of the return of the Jews, and of the zeal with which the Gentiles bring them back.

It is also agreeable to the general word of prophecy to conceive that there will be, together with that vision, and the preaching of the messengers, a remarkable pouring out of the spirit, or pentecostal day over all the earth.

We have to add also, the trumpet sounding, which shall to all proclaim the final Jubilee to be come.

If we consult the prophecies of Isaiah, which relate to the final restoration of the Jews, we shall find not only the trumpet, and the messengers spoken of, but also a sign or ensign (σημειον, Septuag.) raised up, Isaiah xi. 12.; xviii. 3.; lxvi. 19, 20.

From all that is said, of looking at him that is *pierced*, I feel inclined to advance a step farther, and say, that there may be something (not now to be understood, as to the particular manner of it) which, in the heavenly vision, will shew that he who now appears in power and glory was crucified and slain. How would such

an object, together with the influence of the Holy Spirit, affect every heart? whilst it spoke terror to infidels and blasphemers, it would, to the penitent and humble, say, "Fear not; I am he that liveth and was dead: lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh."

I. S.

## AN ATTEMPT TO EXPLAIN THE VISION OF DANIEL, SEEN IN THE REIGN OF DARIUS THE MEDE.

*To the Editors of the Jewish Expositor.*

Gentlemen,

In the course of much anxious enquiry respecting the prophecy of Daniel, and the ninth chapter in particular, I was led some years ago to examine what effect would arise from interpreting the word שבעים throughout the whole chapter in its usual sense, the same which it bears in the second verse, i. e. as meaning *seventy*. When I did so, I thought that a plain and consistent sense seemed to appear, only the word *seven* (שבעה) in the 25th verse opposed an obstacle to it. But being afterwards made acquainted with the Laudian MSS. A. and its reading שבה instead of שבעה, and finding from Kennicott in what high estimation* this MS. was held by him, I have adopted this reading, and now venture to submit to you an explanation of the whole founded on these changes.

The vision described by Daniel in the ninth chapter being given as an answer to prayer, and that prayer founded on the promises of God communicated by the prophet Jeremiah, these promises shall first be considered.

During the reign of Zedekiah, after the captivity of Jehoiakim, when false prophets rose up at Babylon, who assured the people of a speedy return, it pleased God to send a message to the captives directing them to remain there, and to pray for the peace of the city where they dwelt, for that they should not now return, but that the Lord would visit and restore them in seventy years.

These are the words of the prophetic message:—"Thus saith the Lord, that after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon, I will visit you and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place. For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the Lord, thoughts of peace and not of evil, to give you an expected end. Then shall ye call upon me, and ye shall go and pray unto me, and I will hearken unto you. And ye shall seek me and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart. And I will be found of you, saith the Lord, and I will turn away your captivity, and I will gather you from all the nations, and from

* He calls it "perantiquus" and "præstantissimus."

all the places whither I have driven you, saith the Lord, and I will bring you again into the place whence I have caused you to be carried away captive." Jer. xxix. 10—14.

This precious promise, no doubt, was the consolation of all the faithful captives during their bondage; but particularly when Belshazzar, the Babylonian tyrant was overthrown, and the kingdom given to the Medes and Persians, their hearts must have been raised with hope and expectation. Daniel, however, could not now have expected final restoration, if he duly weighed what was revealed to him in a former vision, (chap. viii.) that a nation now in its infancy in the west, the Grecian, would overcome the present deliverers of the Jews, and from them would arise a desolating power which should persecute and oppress them before that final happiness was vouchsafed.

Daniel, however, now prays earnestly for mercy and pardon to be granted to his nation, and that the face of the Lord "may shine upon the sanctuary which is desolate," and that he may be gracious to "the city and people that are called by his name."

The angel commissioned to bring an answer to his prayer, informs him, what things he is to know and understand from the prophecy of Jeremiah, on which he rested. He instructs him in two points; 1st, That the restoration of the sanctuary will surely take place in the seventieth year, and more fully in sixty-two years after. 2ndly, That as to the gathering of the people from all nations, this would not take place in any definite number of years; the promise was conditional, and would be fulfilled when the people "should turn to the Lord with their whole heart;" before which consummation, other desolations and afflictions and further chastisements must be endured.

The words of the angel are in substance these:—

"Seventy seventy,* (years) are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city; to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to anoint the most holy." Know, therefore, and understand, concerning the going forth of the word for returning and building Jernsalem, that to the anointed chief, shall be seventy years; and in seventy and sixty and two years, it shall return and be built up, enlarged, and confirmed. And in the end of times,† and after the seventy,

* The word שבעים is translated *seventy*, throughout our English Bible, excepting in a few instances:—1st. Lev. xii. 5. "two weeks," the word here is the dual of שבע, and of course signifies *twice seven*. 2d. 1 Sam. ii. 5. "full." 3d. Dan. ix. "weeks." 4th. Dan. x. 3. שלשה שבעים ימים, "till three whole weeks were fulfilled."—Might not this be translated (as a friend has suggested to me) *three full days?* If the meaning then, given in other parts of the Bible, be either *seventy*, or *full*, or *twice seven*, does it not afford a presumption against that of *weeks* used in chap. ix.

† See the Syriac and Arabic versions.

sixty, and two years, the anointed one shall be cut off, and it shall not be his, and the people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and to the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm a league with many for one week,* (of years) and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and upon the border there will be the abominations that make desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured on the desolator."

By the "anointed chief," in the foregoing part of the angel's words, I suppose, is meant the establishment of the priesthood. The priest, Lev. iv. is called "the anointed," and from the authority with which in later times he was invested, the appellation of "chief" might be added. But the priesthood could not be in office unless the sanctuary was set up, where the morning and evening sacrifice, and the service of the great day of atonement should be performed; therefore, their being anointed, and the building of the sanctuary or temple must be cotemporary.

The fulfilment of the words of the angel, respecting this anointing, and the building of the temple, will appear by inspecting the following list of reigns.

| | Years. |
|---|---|
| Nebuchadnezzar | 43 |
| Evilmerodach | 3 |
| Neriglisser | 5 |
| Belshazzar | 17 |
| Darius, the Mede | 2 |
| Cyrus | 7 |
| Cambyses | 8 |
| Darius Hystaspes | 36 |
| Xerxes | 21 |
| Artaxerxes | 41 |

By reckoning here, from the eighteenth of Nebuchadnezzar, (this year included) the year of the sanctuary or temple's desolation, to the second of Darius, when the rebuilding of it commenced, we find there are seventy years as the angel first declared: and also, we reckon sixty-two years more from thence to the seventh of Artaxerxes, when was the full establishment of the sanctuary and of the Jewish state—i. e. seventy, and sixty, and two years from the desolation of the temple to this, according to the next words of the angel.

In the latter part of the angel's prophecy, "the end of times," is substituted for the usual translation, in "troublous times," and it is supposed, that a transition is at once made from the building of the second temple to the end of the world. Such transitions are frequent in the prophets; let one eminent instance be here adduced; Isaiah vii. 12. where the prophet so speedily passes from the overthrow of the kingdoms of Israel and Syria to the fall of antichrist, the millenial state, and the final gathering of the

* The word שבוע a Chaldee word, (a ו inserted in it) signifies a week.

people of Israel. But here, especially, (Dan. ix.) such transition appears natural, for as the prophecy of Jeremiah which the angel explains, consisted of two branches, one relating to a near return in the seventieth year, and the other to the final gathering from all nations, so the words of the angel might be expected to embrace the same objects.

In this latter part then, those final* desolations are foretold, which, are to precede the gathering of the Jews, desolations which are brought in by antichrist, and which will end in his fall.

He comes in first by guile and flatteries, most probably setting himself up as the Messiah expected by the Jews, then he proceeds to bring in idolatry among the people, and makes a league with many, with those whom he can corrupt or delude into a fatal union with himself. This league will last seven years, and in the latter half of this period he brings in all manner of abominations, and spreads desolation. He persecutes all who disobey him, but soon he is overthrown, and all the blessings delineated in the first words of the angel, are then accomplished. "An end is made of sins, and reconciliation, everlasting righteousness, and the anointing of the holy of holies are brought in." I. S.

* Then shall *the end* come, when ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, &c. Matt. xxiv. 14, 15.

## ON THE SABBATH.

### No. VI.

Gentlemen,

THE last point which I proposed proving, is, that the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles observed the first day, and that the primitive Christians followed their example. When our Lord arose from the dead, then was he freed from the power and sentence of the law, for which he had undertaken to make satisfaction. Then were fulfilled all the types and prophecies which concerned our redemption. Then was he declared to be the Son of God with power. Thus did the author of the new creation, even the second person in the ever-glorious Trinity, the builder of the church, finish his work, and enter into his rest on the first day of the week. We find that the apostles were assembled on that very day, and our Lord appeared three times in it; first to Mary Magdalene in the morning, in the middle of the day to the two disciples going to Emmaus, and in the evening to the assembled disciples, "when the doors were shut for fear of the Jews." John xx. 19. The manner in which the Holy Ghost records it, is worthy of observation; the first day of the week is twice mentioned, no doubt, that we should take notice, of his approval of their assembling on that day, and of his honouring this precise day by his appearing three times to the disciples in it. And after eight

days, when Thomas was with them, who was absent before, he appeared to them again. Here occurred a Jewish Sabbath, in which Christ did not appear to his disciples, for it is expressly said that, when he appeared to them as they were fishing, "This is now the third time that Jesus shewed himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead." John xxi. 14. It is therefore clear that our Saviour honoured this day with his presence, and this was no common favour, but choice and special evidence of his peculiar regard, for he did not appear to all persons nor at all times, but to select chosen witnesses who were either eminently devoted to his service or designed to teach others, and twice he chose the day consecrated by his blessed resurrection. By his heavenly instructions, he opened the scriptures, and preached peace to his disciples, "having slain the enmity of the cross, he came and preached peace." Ep. ii. 16. 17. He again gave his disciples their commission, and he allowed unbelieving Thomas the proof which he required, of his Lord's resurrection, and it is very probable that he again celebrated the sacred supper, for it is said "that he was known to them in breaking of bread," Luke xxiv. 30, 35. and this is the term generally used throughout the New Testament for that ordinance. St. John, whom we may naturally suppose to be fully acquainted with the mind of Christ, says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day," Rev. i. 10; and surely this royal name or title, adds no small honour to this day, the very name speaks the Lord Christ to be the author of it, who upon the day of his resurrection was declared both Lord and Christ, and this was certainly the day on which the churches assembled for the worship of God. In the 6th and 7th verses of the xxth chapter of Acts, we find that St. Paul abode at Troas seven days, but on the first day of the week only is it recorded that the disciples assembled, though a seventh day must likewise have occurred; and when he is writing to the Corinthians he directs their collections for the poor to be made on the first day, when it appears they were all together, or else any other day would have done equally well; and St. John, in calling it the Lord's day, refers to a certain particular day well known to all the churches to whom he wrote, nay, known to all believers and saints of that time.

Ignatius was a disciple of St. John, and died about nine years after him; in the epistle which he wrote to the Magnesians, according to the edition of Archbishop Usher, he urges them not to Judaize but to live as Christians, "not any longer observing the Jewish but the Lord's day on which Christ our life rose again.' Instead of the sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep holy the Lord Christ's day, in memory of his

resurrection, wherein spiritual life received a beginning, and death was vanquished."

The account likewise which Justin Martyr gives, is in confirmation of this day, he says, "On the day called Sunday there is an assembly of all Christians, whether living in the city, or the country, and there are publicly read the memorials or monuments of the apostles, or the writings of the prophets;" again, "The day called Sunday, we do all in common make the meeting day, for that the first day is it, in which God from darkness and matter made the world, and our Saviour Christ did rise from the dead." To this I may add the testimony of an heathen, for Pliny, writing to the emperor Trajan, accuses the Christians of meeting early on this day, and singing hymns to Christ. St. Athanasius likewise speaks to the same effect: "The sabbath was in great esteem among the ancients, but the Lord hath changed the sabbath into the Lord's day, not we by our authority have slighted the old sabbath, but because it did belong to the pedagogy of the law, when Christ the great master came, it became useless, as the candle is put out when the sun shines." I might cite many other primitive Christians, but have, I hope, sufficiently proved the point of their observance of the first day instead of the seventh.

To conclude, let not any one professing to believe in the atonement and satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ, doubt of the change of the sabbath; for God having built all things upon Jesus Christ, this day of rest, stands as firm as the foundation. This was the first day of Christ's kingdom; the day Christ rested from his work; the day our redemption was finished; the day when all the shadows of the law ceased, and death was vanquished; the day on which the disciples met, and Christ preached peace to them; the day on which St. John saw the Lord Jesus Christ walking in the midst of the seven churches of Asia; the day of the miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit; the day when the first gospel churches met to break bread, and to preach the word of life; the day when collections were made for the poor in all churches of the saints; and this is the day to which our Lord Jesus Christ lays claim; on all other days we may work, but this is his own day, which we must give up wholly to him, and which the godly have observed in every age of the New Testament church, to the present time. This, therefore, is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it; let us come into his presence with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise: For the Lord hath made known his salvation, his righteousness hath he openly shewed in the sight of the heathen: He hath remembered his mercy and truth towards the house of Israel, and all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God.

PHILALETHES.

## OBSERVATIONS RESPECTING THE CABBALA.

The following observations respecting the Cabbala have been communicated to the Committee from some learned friends at Frankfort, of which a further account will be given in a future number.

The Trinity, the Fall of mankind, and the Redemption, are dogmas generally known and received among the cabbalists. They form the fundamental doctrines of the whole system, and of all their mystical explanations of the holy scriptures in general, and of the prophets in particular. Many cabbalists are, therefore, true Christians in their hearts; and all the learned Jews, who in former times have been converted to Christianity, have drawn their conviction simply from the Cabbala.

In the days when our Lord lived here on earth, the Cabbala and the Talmud (both together called the oral tradition) were not yet written; and the first of them, containing the *secret* of the doctrine, was known only to few persons among the people; the great bulk being only occupied with the *externals* of religion and of worship. St. Paul, St. John, and other disciples, were, according to a Jewish tradition, much versed in the law and in the mysteries; and some of the first fathers of the church appear likewise to have known them more intimately. But, in general, the living spirit was in those times lost by the dominion of the dead letter, and men of learning were puffed up by the conceit of knowledge. Those who were in the secret, saw the tokens of the time, and they ought to have been the first to be led by them to the knowledge of the Lord. But the pride and the hardness of their hearts did not permit it.

When the people of Israel had lost their national independance, and it was to be apprehended, lest the oral doctrine might be adulterated or entirely lost in the general dispersion, it was determined to write it down, in order thus to rescue it from oblivion. And in this manner the Talmud was first brought to paper; and after, it was found advisable to do the same with respect to the Cabbala. Yet, as to the Cabbala, care was taken, to involve it into dark figures, in order, thereby, to obstruct the access to the sanctuary for unholy curiosity, and to secure it against profanation.

In subsequent times, when Christians and Jews were separated from one another, the first cared very little for the Jewish Cabbala, it became perfectly strange to them. The Jews, on the contrary, were

eager to avail themselves of every means in their power to shew the errors of Christianity; and, therefore, contrived to intermix their writings with many absurd and insipid things, whereby they imagined to give more consistency to Judaism. But the rabbies endeavoured to keep the cabbalistical writings as much concealed as possible, and to dissuade all the young persons from studying the cabbala, lest they therein should discover arguments in favour of Christianity. The rabbies avoided carefully in their sermons the mentioning of those more sublime cabbalistical notions, as for instance, Trinity, in order not to remind their hearers, of Christianity; they laid hold only on the visible letter, and thus Judaism sunk so low, as to become a mere body without a soul; and the Jews lost the true meaning of their own religion. The whole Talmud is full of cabbalistical ideas, and without the Cabbala a great, and especially the more profound part of it, is absolutely unintelligible, and appears to him, who is not in possession of the key, as mere nonsense. All the Jews know the Cabbala by name; but care has been taken, to remove it out of their sight, and to make the access to it as difficult as possible. Thus, in the present times, you scarcely will meet with a Jew, who makes it his study; and then he is obliged to do it in secret. But if a Jew should be known to read the Cabbala with a Christian, he most certainly would be excommunicated as a traitor of the sanctuary. Here are some tenets out of the Cabbala as a preliminary proof:—

1. God the *Father* is called *Attik*, (the Old, El, Elion, the highest God, the hidden Alpha, the Father of mercy, the grey head. But the *Son* is called *Seir* (the young or the little one). He is also called the pronounced word, (Memrah) which was in the beginning with the Father, and by which all things were made. The pronounced word is, moreover, called, the man in the high places; and his name is *Jehovah*. The *Holy Ghost* who proceeds from the Father, and from the Son, is called the Shechina, (the in-dwelling of the interior light.) The Son operates and speaks mediately only through the Holy Ghost within man. But in some few cases, the Son reveals himself to the godly in an immediate way, as, for instance, to Moses, who has spoken to the Son face to face. But no man has spoken here in life, with the Father, he is the hidden beginning, and the soul can come to him only through the Son, and to the Son only through the Holy Ghost; wherefore, the prayers ought to begin with an invocation of the Holy Spirit; Adonai, open thou my lips. For the rest, the cabbalists do symbolize the Father as an old man with grey hair; the Son, in a straight line below the Father, as a youth in juvenile beauty, and below both of the

former, the Holy Ghost as a dove. But they say, that these symbolical figures must be kept secret, lest the sensual people might be led to idolatry by such figurative representations.

2. The bridegroom in the Canticles, is likewise the Son, and the bride signifies the church of Israel. The Holy Ghost is also called the Mother, and sometimes the bride; and Jehovah is called both the bridegroom and the Father of the church of Israel. The Wisdom spoken of by Solomon, is the Holy Ghost; he is also called the mouth of God. To the Holy Ghost, moreover, is attributed the revelation of the mysterious number *seven*, which is in general the mystical number of nature and of man.

3. The seven-branched candlestick represents the mystery of Trinity. In an especial manner it alludes to the Son, in union with the Holy Spirit. The seven candles typify the seven primordial powers, the seven times, the seven ages of the world.

4. By the sin of Adam, all mankind fell into the *Tumah* (defilement), and became subject to the dominion of Satan. A very peculiar symbol and consequence of the universal fall, is the triple captivity of Israel, being, as it were, a thrice repeated fall under the dominion of the powers of darkness. The redemption from these captivities, is likewise a symbol of the universal redemption, and intimately connected with it.

5. Israel fell thrice into captivity. Twice it was redeemed by men as instruments of God. But, for the third time, it will be redeemed by God, without any other instrumentality, to fall no more. For at the third redemption, the seventh age of the world, the great sabbath, the great year of jubilee, predicted by the prophets, will begin, when the power of Satan shall be subdued, and all evil be extirpated.

6. The law owes its origin to the rigour of the severity occasioned by sin. But when the Messiah is arrived, the yoke of the law will be removed, and all the unclean things will be cleansed.

7. There are two Messiahs, the one is called Ben Joseph, (the son of Joseph) He is the suffering Messiah, because he is to shed his blood for the sins of men. And when Messiah the son of Joseph, shall have suffered, *then Israel* (as it is stated in the book of Sohar) *will go into captivity*. But the other Messiah is called Ben David (the son of David). He will appear at a later period, to gather Israel, and to restore the throne and the kingdom of David.

These and many other tenets are to be found in the Cabbala and in the Talmud. There prevails a resemblance between the Cabbala and the doctrines of Christianity, not only in *general*, but the consonance

extends to the most particular points; wherefore, it may truly be said, that the Cabbala is Christianity in the promise.

An Israelite who understands the Cabbala well, cannot be offended at Christianity, for he will discover the most striking and most intimate references between the former and the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Revelation of St. John. In all these works he will not find any thing new to him, but only the accurate fulfilment of all that which before the vail was rent, was known among the doctors of the law as a secret tradition. Then the Jews will make no difficulty in receiving the doctrines of Christianity. For the apparently new doctrines, are, in fact, the old doctrines, always taught by the wise men in Israel. The only remaining question would be; If *Jesus* was the Messiah Ben Joseph? But as to that point, arguments may be found in plenty by the Jew.

Yet in my opinion, we ought not to begin, but to end by proving, that Jesus is the Messiah. The Jews must by degrees be familiarized with the truths of Christianity, they must learn to understand themselves and Judaism. Then they, of their own accord, will discover in Judaism, the promise of Christianity, and be convinced, that Christianity does not lead to Polytheism, but comprehends the pure doctrine of Trinity, as revealed by Moses and the prophets; not indeed, in plain expressions, for the sake of a sensual people, always prone to idolatry, but in some expressive hints, which may be discovered in the clearly distinguished names of God in the Bible, El, Elion, Jehovah, Elohim, Adonai.

The whole of Christianity is indeed comprehended in the writings of the Jews. But, as we may easily conceive, these doctrines are not there collected into a system, and displayed openly to the sight, but dispersed through the vast multitude of books; They are raw jewels: therefore, they must be laboriously gathered, brought to light, explained in their interior tendency, and exhibited in connection with the other doctrines of Judaism. But hereto time is required, and the necessary supply of books.

The work ought not, in my opinion, to make its true tendency, viz. to lead the Jews to Christianity, too conspicuous in the first volumes. For, in that case, very few among them would read it, and it would be looked upon with suspicion. I would rather have it considered, as *a clearer elucidation of Judaism.*

---

*The List of Contributions to the London Society, are omitted for want of room; but will appear in our next Number.*

For use in Library only

For use in Library only

I-7 v.4
Jewish Expositor and Friend of Israel
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00314 8097